

## REMARKS

### A. Introduction

Claims 1-3, 6, 15 and 17 were pending and under consideration. Claims were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action of December 9, 2009 ("the Office Action"), claims 1-3, 6, 15 and 17 were rejected as obvious.

Without conceding to the merits of the rejections, claims have been amended to clarify an aspect of the present general inventive concept and claims are newly added. No new matter has been introduced.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the following.

### B. Rejection under 35 USC §112

Claims 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In response, the subject matter at issue has been omitted from the claim thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

### C. Rejection under 35 USC §103

1. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,931,782 over Jackson in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0153360 to Yamazaki. The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 presently requires, *inter alia*, "the whole face of the display panel includes a sealing panel formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter." As provided by the Specification, providing color filters on a driving side of the sealing substrate provides the filters with weatherability and prevents unevenness. See para. 0046.

Jackson is limited to a cathode ray tube (12) that does not have filters. Thus, Jackson is unable to disclose or fairly suggest "the whole face of the display panel includes a sealing panel formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter," as recited by independent claim 1.

Yamazaki is likewise limited to a laser irradiating apparatus, which does not have filters. Thus, Yamazaki is also unable to disclose or fairly suggest "the whole face of the display panel includes a sealing panel formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter," as recited by independent claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Jackson nor Yamazaki, separately or in combination, disclose or suggest every element of independent claim 1, and this claim is patentable over these references. Further, claims depending from independent claim 1 include all of the limitations of independent claim 1, and are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

2. Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Jackson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,835,950 to Brown. The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 17 presently requires, *inter alia*, "a sealing panel between the driving panel and the touch panel that is formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter." As provided above, color filters on a driving side of the sealing substrate provides the filters with weatherability and prevents unevenness. See para. 0046.

Jackson is limited to a cathode ray tube (12) that does not have filters. Thus, Jackson is unable to disclose or fairly suggest "the whole face of the display panel includes a sealing panel formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter," as recited by independent claim 17.

Brown is likewise limited to an electronic device, which does not have filters. Thus, Brown is also unable to disclose or fairly suggest "the whole face of the display panel includes a

Serial No.: 10/674,255  
Docket No.: 09792909-5694  
Amendment dated March 8, 2010  
Reply to the Office Action of December 9, 2009

sealing panel formed directly on (a) a second adhesive layer and (b) at least one filter," as recited by independent claim 17.

Accordingly, neither Jackson nor Brown, separately or in combination, disclose or suggest every element of independent claim 17, and this claim is patentable over these references. Further, claims depending from independent claim 17 include all of the limitations of independent claim 17, and are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 17.

**D. New Claims**

New claims 18 and 19 have been added. Support for the new claim can be found in the specification and drawings, for example, Fig. 1 and corresponding portions of the Specification. New claim recite features, which are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art of record.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 18 and 19 do not present new matter and are allowable over the prior art of record, and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/674,255  
Docket No.: 09792909-5694  
Amendment dated March 8, 2010  
Reply to the Office Action of December 9, 2009

**E. Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,  
SONNENSCHIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By           /Adam C. Rehm/            
Adam C. Rehm, Reg. No. 54,797  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
Suite 7800  
Chicago, IL 60606-6404  
816-460-2542 (telephone)  
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT